Subject: Chat with Erik Kain
From: Erik Kain <erik.kain@gmail.com>
To: barriticus@gmail.com

me: "Anarcho capitalism. What a crock of bull.

I think I'm of average intelligence, but this is really just another pie in the sky philosophy to me. If it was actually doable as a viable philosophy, why are there no governments which practice it."
Erik: are you quoting someone?
me: a commenter at Little Green Footballs
Erik: ah
Erik: gotcha
Erik: yes - why has no government tried anarchy
Erik: let's puzzle over this for a moment
me: my calculator is broken, so
me: I posted same post there yesterday as I did at league
me: significant fucking difference in reaction
Erik: actually anarchism is looking more and more like the only viable political philosophy, or at least the only honest one. Anarcho-capitalism seems entirely reasonable to me.
me: my year-old alliance with charles Johnson is over
Erik: too hawkish
me: yeah, I've only become more convinced of anarchism's viability as time goes on
me: I'll write soon about the possibilities provided for anarchist entities via internet
Erik: very cool
me: Project PM is my experimental example
Erik: Here's Joe Sobran:
Erik: For most people, anarchy is a disturbing word, suggesting chaos, violence, antinomianism — things they hope the state can control or prevent. The term state, despite its bloody history, doesn't disturb them. Yet it's the state that is truly chaotic, because it means the rule of the strong and cunning. They imagine that anarchy would naturally terminate in the rule of thugs. But mere thugs can't assert a plausible right to rule. Only the state, with its propaganda apparatus, can do that. This is what legitimacy means. Anarchists obviously need a more seductive label.

"But what would you replace the state with?" The question reveals an inability to imagine human society without the state. Yet it would seem that an institution that can take 200,000,000 lives within a century hardly needs to be "replaced."
me: yeah, and that's exactly the argument I use
me: that perhaps they need to justify their forced-based system
me: rather than us justify not using force

me: or not initiating it
Erik: and of course they will come up with a million examples to justify force and the monopoly of violence
me: if you want to see a frankly horrendous example of the argument, look at that thread
Erik: I will
me: http://littlegreenfootballs.com/page/232392_U.S._purposefully_kills_journa
Erik: though I'm not surprised, sadly
me: I was, at the extent of the hostility
me: anyway, that's blogging
me: see you at the ol' league
Erik: yes indeed
Erik: damn straight